

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 1-36 are pending in the above-identified application.

The Examiner rejected claims 33-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 2, as being indefinite for reciting a phrase that would not be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. The Examiner rejected claims 33-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter for not containing features that place them in the technological arts.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 10-11, 13-26, 28-29 and 31-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minton U.S. patent No. 6,014,643 (hereinafter "Minton") in view of Robertson et al. European patent application No. 0 665 489 A2 (hereinafter "Robertson"). The Examiner rejected claims 9, 12, 27, 30 and 35-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minton and Robertson and in further view of Harrington et al. U.S. patent No. 6,161,099 (hereinafter "Harrington").

Claims 1-32 remain in this application. Claims 33-36 have been canceled without prejudice. Applicants reserve

the right to pursue claims 33-36 in one or more continuing applications. Claims 1-17 and 13-32 have been amended to more particularly define the claimed invention. No new subject matter has been added and the amendments to the claims are fully supported by the application as filed. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

II. Claims 33-36

The Examiner rejected claims 33-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 2, as being indefinite. The Examiner rejected claims 33-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner rejected claims 33-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minton in view of Robertson. The Examiner rejected claims 35-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minton and Robertson and in further view of Harrington.

The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 33-36 have been canceled without prejudice. Applicants reserve the right to pursue

claims 33-36 in one or more continuing applications.
Applicants request the rejections of claims 33-36 be
withdrawn.

III. Claims 1-32

A. Summary of claims 1 and 19

Applicants' independent claims 1 and 19 are directed
to systems and methods for submitting trade commands in an
electronic trading system.

More particularly, amended claims 1 and 19 specify
receiving a submission of a bid, offer, buy, or sell command
from a trader via a first interface - e.g., an entry
interface. In response to this submission, a second interface
- e.g., a trading interface - for confirming the command
entered by the trader is displayed. Requiring confirmation
from the trader that the correct trading command was entered
ensures that substantially only correct entries are submitted.
The second interface contains information that relates to any
bid, offer, buy, or sell command. In other words, the same
second interface is presented regardless of the type of
command that is submitted by the trader via the first

interface. The information contained in the second interface, such as the information populating the fields in the second interface, may correspond to the particular command submitted by the trader via the first interface. The command is then submitted in response to the trader confirming the submission. Claim 1 further specifies confirming the submission through the selection of a button in the second interface over which a pointing device pointer is automatically repositioned.

B. The 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

i. The rejections of claims
1-8, 10-11, 13-26, 28-29 and 31-32

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 10-11, 13-26, 28-29 and 31-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minton in view of Robertson. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner contends that Minton and Robertson, taken together, disclose all the features of applicants' independent claims 1 and 19. However, applicants respectfully submit that neither Minton nor Robertson show or suggest all the features of claims 1 and 19, as amended.

Minton relates to a data processing system that allows an individual to enter an offer to buy or sell a security using a first screen (trading screen 400), select a particular security through a second screen (pricing screen 500) and either confirm an order to buy the security through a third screen (buy screen 600) or confirm an order to sell the security through a fourth screen (sell screen 700).

Robertson merely relates to a system that automatically repositions a cursor at a determined location on a computer display when, for example, a new window is opened in response to a command being entered.

Applicants submit that neither Minton nor Robertson show or suggest all the features of each of claims 1 and 19. Minton's screen 500 is displayed in response to the activation of a button that is used to select a security about which a trader wishes to receive information. (Minton, col. 8, lines 42-45) Therefore, unlike the second interface specified in claims 1 and 19, screen 500 is not displayed in response to the submission of a bid, offer, buy or sell command. Moreover, unlike the second interface specified in claims 1

and 19, screen 500 may not be used to confirm the bid, offer, buy, or sell command.

Instead, two separate and distinct screens are disclosed in Minton: 1) buy screen 600 for entering information relating to and confirming an order to buy a security, and 2) sell screen 700 for entering information related to and confirming an order to sell a security. Each one of screens 600 and 700 relates to only one of buying or selling a security. (Minton, col. 10, line 54 through col. 12, line 42) This is in stark contrast to an interface that contains information relating to any bid, offer, buy, or sell command, as specified in claims 1 and 19. That is because, unlike the different screens disclosed in Minton, the same second interface is presented regardless of the type of command that is submitted by the trader via the first interface.

Accordingly, Minton does not show or suggest applicants' improvement of allowing for the confirmation of a submission of a particular bid, offer, buy, or sell command via the same interface that is presented in response to the submission and that contains information relating to any bid,

offer, buy, or sell command, as specified in claims 1 and 19. Robertson, on the other hand, is limited to controlling the position of a cursor on a computer display and does not show or suggest applicants' aforementioned improvement.

Because neither Minton nor Robertson, taken together or separately, show or suggest all the features of each of amended independent claims 1 and 19, applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 19 are allowable over Winton and Robertson. Because claims 2-8, 10-11 and 13-18 depend from claim 1, and claims 20-26, 28-29 and 31-32 depend from claim 19, applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also allowable over Winton and Robertson for at least the same reasons as the independent claims. Applicants therefore request that the rejections of claims 1-8, 10-11, 13-26, 28-29 and 31-32 be withdrawn.

ii. The rejections of claims
claims 9, 12, 27 and 30

The Examiner rejected claims 9, 12, 27 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minton and Robertson and in further view of Harrington. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Appl. No. 09/745,651
Reply dated July 28, 2004
Reply to Office Action of January 28, 2004

Applicants have demonstrated that claims 1 and 19 are allowable over Minton and Robertson. Because claims 9 and 12 depend from allowable claim 1, and claims 27 and 30 depend from allowable claim 19, applicants respectfully submit that claims 9, 12, 27 and 30 are allowable. Applicants therefore request that the rejections of claims 9, 12, 27 and 30 be withdrawn.

IV. Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance. Entry of the amendments and a favorable action are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hassan Albakri
(Limited Recognition)
Agent for Applicants
FISH & NEAVE
Customer No. 1473
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020-1105
Tel.: (212) 596-9000